

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12-22, 24-27 and 29-34 are pending.

### I. Objection to the Claims

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 2, claim 33 was objected to. Claim 33 recites "a first image processor." Thus, the first image processor does not lack antecedent basis, as antecedent basis is only first asserted in line 1 of claim 33. In addition, claim 33 recites "a second image processor" at line 2. Thus, the second image processor does not lack antecedent basis, as antecedent basis is only first asserted in line 2 of claim 33. Claim 33 particularly recites "further comprising: a first image processor" and "a second image processor."

Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

### II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at page 4, numbered paragraph 4, claims 1, 4, 8, 12, 13, 16, 20, 25-30 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Publication No. 0575169 to Shimura et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed because Shimura does not discuss or suggest:

generating first image data image-processed into a format suitable for use in a color image forming engine by a first image processor disposed within the color image forming apparatus;

generating second image data image-processed into a format suitable for use in the color image forming engine by a second image processor disposed outside the color image forming apparatus; and

receiving the first and the second image data and selectively outputting at least one of the received first and second image data to the color image forming engine via an image data controller disposed within the first image processor,

as recited in independent claim 1.

Shimura discusses an information processing apparatus including a determination unit for determining a ratio of share to rasterization of information in data outputted to the printer to be shared by a rasterizer in the printer.

Shimura does not discuss or suggest that at least one of received first and second image data is selectively outputted to a color image forming engine via an image data controller disposed within the first image processor. Shimura discusses only determining a ratio of share of parallel processing between the first rasterizer 104 or 105 of the host computer 100 and the second rasterizer 202 of the printer 1500 so that the rasterization of the font may be distributed in accordance with the performances of the host computer 100 and the printer 1500. Shimura does not suggest image data that has been image-processed into a format suitable for use in a color image forming engine is received and that the received at least one of the first and second image data is selectively outputted to a color image forming engine via an image data controller that is disposed within a first image processor disposed within a first image processor disposed within a color image forming apparatus.

Specifically, Shimura does not discuss that data output from any of the rasterizers is selectively output to a color image forming engine via an image data controller disposed within a first image processor in the printer 1500. Shimura does not discuss, and the Examiner fails to address, that the printer 1500 includes a color image forming engine or an image data controller disposed within an image process of the printer 1500. The printer 1500 includes a print controller 205, but Shimura does not suggest that image data output from the rasterizers 104, 105, 202 is output to a color image forming engine via an image data controller disposed within a first image processor disposed within a color image forming apparatus. The print controller 205 does not output image data to a color image forming engine and the print controller 205 is not an image data controller disposed within a first image processor that generates first image data into a format suitable for use in a color image forming engine.

Therefore, as Shimura does not discuss or suggest "generating first image data image-processed into a format suitable for use in a color image forming engine by a first image processor disposed within the color image forming apparatus; generating second image data image-processed into a format suitable for use in the color image forming engine by a second image processor disposed outside the color image forming apparatus; and receiving the first and the second image data and selectively outputting at least one of the received first and second image data to the color image forming engine via an image data controller disposed within the first image processor," as recited in independent claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Shimura does not discuss or suggest “an image data controller disposed within the first image processor and which receives the first and second image data and which selectively outputs at least one of the first and second image data to the color image forming engine,” as recited in independent claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Also, Shimura does not discuss or suggest “an image data controller disposed in a first image processor that includes the first image data generator and which receives the first and the second image data, and selectively outputs the first and the second image data; and a color image forming engine which receives the first and the second data from the image data controller and which is disposed in the color image forming apparatus,” as recited in independent claim 26. Therefore, claim 26 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 25, 27-30 and 32-34 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 13 and 26 and include all the features of their respective independent claims, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. For example, claim 4 recites that “the first image processor is slower than the second image processor.” Therefore, claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 25, 27-30 and 32-34 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, at pages 8-12, numbered paragraphs 6-9, claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17-19, 21, 22, 24 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Shimura, U.S. Patent No. 5,600,804 to Ip, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0061892 to Ferlitsch, U.S. Patent No. 5,699,492 to Karaki, and U.S. Patent No. 5,681,642 to Sugisaki et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Shimura does not discuss or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 13 and 26. Ip, Ferlitsch, Karaki and Sugisaki fail to make up for the deficiencies in Shimura. Therefore, claims 1, 13 and 26 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17-19, 21, 22, 24 and 31 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 13 and 26 and include all the features of their respective

independent claims, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. For example, claim 2 recites that "the second image processor is a system expansion card which is insertable into the host computer." Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17-19, 21, 22, 24 and 31 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-10, 12-22, 24-27 and 29-34 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-23-08

By: 

Micheal J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501